

REMARKS

Claims 3-4 and 7-15 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

Claims 7-15 have been added to claim additional features of the invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Soichi (JP 09-015560).

This rejection is respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention, as exemplarily described by claim 3, is directed to a liquid crystal display device. Pixels equipped with a liquid crystal cell and a switch element, are arranged at positions where scan lines and data lines intersect. A data line drive circuit supplies from the data line and the switch element to the liquid crystal cell a write signal corresponding with image data. A control circuit inverts a polarity of the write signal after every plurality of scan lines.

A scan line drive circuit supplies a drive signal to the scan lines and switches the switch elements ON and OFF while maintaining a constant horizontal scanning period, so that of the plurality of scan lines to which is supplied a write signal of a same polarity, in

the following scan lines other than those scan lines where the polarity of the write signal is inverted, the drive signal is supplied for a period of time that is shorter, by a predetermined amount of time, than a time for which the drive signal is supplied to the scan lines where the polarity of the write signal is inverted.

The present invention thereby provides a liquid crystal display which has low power consumption, and which prevents horizontal stripes from occurring without the circuitry becoming more complex.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that Soichi anticipates the teaches the present invention defined by claims 3 and 4. Applicant submits, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by Soichi, when is interpreted in view of the plain meaning of the language of the claims.

That is, Soichi is described beginning at line 15 on page 6 of the present Application. Soichi clearly differs from the present invention in that it adjusts the timing interval that defines the scan period of each line scan by using a pulse counter to determine that scan line periods during those scans in which polarity is inverted are lengthened.

Although the present invention may achieve a similar result to that of Soichi, it achieves this result by using a different principle. That is, in contrast to Soichi, the present invention does not change the timing interval for respective scan intervals.

Rather, the present invention clearly differs by maintaining a constant horizontal scanning period.

Hence, turning to the clear language of the claims, in Soichi, there is no teaching

or suggestion of: "... a scan line drive circuit which supplies a drive signal to said scan lines and switches said switch elements ON and OFF while maintaining a constant horizontal scanning period, so that, of the plurality of scan lines to which is supplied a write signal of a same polarity, in the following scan lines other than those scan lines where the polarity of said write signal is inverted, said drive signal is supplied for a period of time that is shorter, by a predetermined amount of time, than a time for which said drive signal is supplied to the scan lines where the polarity of said write signal is inverted", as required by claim 3.

Claim 4 defines the specific embodiment in which an output enable signal is derived that controls whether or not to supply the drive signal to the scan line. Applicant respectfully traverses that Soichi teaches or suggests such an output enable signal.

Therefore, Applicant submits that there are elements of the claimed invention that are not taught or suggest by Soichi. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Relative to new claims 7-11, these claims are written in means-plus-function so that the prior art evaluation must consider the structure for the means, as described in the specification, with rejection required to be based on the same structure or its equivalent.

Relative to new independent claim 12, support is found at lines 14-19 of page 9 of the specification. Support for new claims 10 and 15 is found in the description for Figures 7 and 8.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 3-4 and 7-15, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to

Serial No. 10/762,502
Docket No. OSP-15514

pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.


Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: _____

12/23/04



Frederick E. Cooperrider
Registration No. 36,769

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254